

REMARKS

Claims 1-45 are pending in the above-identified application, of which claims 1-12 and 14-45 are allowed. Claim 13 was rejected. With this Amendment, claims 16-18, 20, 21, 23 and 24 were amended, and claim 13 was cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1-12, 14-45 are at issue in the above-identified application.

Objection To Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a), indicating that the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.121(d), enclosed is a copy of Figure 24 with red ink markings showing proposed changes thereto for which approval of the Examiner is requested. The proposed changes are to correct the drawing and do not constitute new matter. In particular, Figure 24 has been amended to show the light source 20, and the spatial light modulator 21. The addition of these features in the figure does not constitute new matter, as these features are well known in the art, and clearly described in the specification as being included in the projector 1. See Specification at page 25, line 21 - page 26, line 2. Corresponding changes were made to the specification.

With the changes to the drawings, the “spatial light modulator” is more specifically shown in the figures. In addition, because the “liquid crystal modulator” is simply one possible structure that may be used as the spatial light modulator, this feature is also shown by item 21 in Figure 24. See Specification at page 26, lines 5-7. Further, the “scanning means” has been deleted from the claims, and the “discharge tube” is simply one possible structure for the light source 20. See Specification at pg. 28, lns. 10-12.

Based on the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner's objections to the Figures be withdrawn.

Objection To Specification and Priority

Applicants have amended the specification, per the Examiner's request. Applicants also enclose a certified copy of the JP2002-203179 application. Withdrawal of these objections are respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Gnaedig et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,313,931). Claim 13 has been cancelled. Thus, this rejection is now moot.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 27, 2005

By: _____



Alison P. Schwartz
Registration No. 43,863
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000